

## THAT EYE SHADE

The Ricketts-Mahoney Manufacture  
in the G. P. O.

### RICKETTS' SWORN TESTIMONY

Which Warrants some Action on the Part of the Public Printer or Mr. McKinley—Letter from Mr. O. B. Lester, and His Thanks to The Globe for the Information in Last Sunday's issue—A Nice State of Affairs.

Mr. O. B. Lester is the contesting plaintiff in the eye shade claimed by Mr. Mahoney. The Globe has received from Mr. Lester the following letter.

223 Indiana Avenue N.W.,  
May 30, 1901.

Editor GLOBE:  
Dear Sir: I enclose you copies of some of the testimony given by Mr. Oscar J. Ricketts and others in the eye shade case. It will be seen that some of these witnesses were mere boys when the matter to which they testified occurred. And they appear to have been paid by the Government for services rendered in the interest of Mahoney.

In view of the relationship existing between Mahoney and Ricketts, of which I had the first knowledge through your publication in The Globe last Sunday, I fully comprehend the reason that these employees who, if not dependent on Ricketts for the tenure of their positions in the Government Printing Office, at least believe they are so dependent, were brought to the case to testify for Mahoney. Ricketts' brother-in-law, instead of men of character and standing, of which there are plenty in that office and whose testimony would have carried conviction had they been able to testify to the facts alleged to exist in regard to the general use of the eye shade in controversy.

In view of the testimony it looks as though Ricketts and Mahoney had turned the G. P. O. into an eye shade factory. Mahoney testified in answer to his attorney's questions, that from the time the first shade was patented in December of 1897, to, say January 1, 1899, "I sold about a little over 1,500 shades." Observe that the testimony shows that he was still making shades in the office up to April 22, last, the time the witness testified. Observe that Ricketts' testimony reads the same, though I had been denounced by this combination of Ricketts and Mahoney. I never dreamed of them being brothers-in-law, and having a common interest in the eye shade case until your expose of their relationship. Observe that Ricketts' testimony reads the same, though I had been denounced by this combination of Ricketts and Mahoney. I never dreamed of them being brothers-in-law, and having a common interest in the eye shade case until your expose of their relationship. Observe that Ricketts' testimony reads the same, though I had been denounced by this combination of Ricketts and Mahoney. I never dreamed of them being brothers-in-law, and having a common interest in the eye shade case until your expose of their relationship.

Yours very truly,  
O. B. LESTER.

Examining the testimony of the witnesses testifying for Mr. Mahoney, The Globe was struck with the pathetic helplessness of the poor devils of employees, who endeavor to please masters and keep their consciences clear from future prickings. Mr. Ricketts' testimony The Globe herewith gives in full to the end that Public Printer Palmer may read the same and take such action as he thinks the good of the public service requires, not only in Mr. Ricketts' case, but also in that of his brother-in-law, Mr. Mahoney, the alleged inventor of the eye shade and the "cock-roach exterminator."

Here is Mr. Ricketts' testimony in behalf of his brother-in-law and subordinate employee:

Oscar J. Ricketts, being duly sworn, deposes and says as follows in answer to questions propounded to him by Mr. Edson:

What is your name, age, residence, and occupation? Oscar J. Ricketts, age 32 years, residence 946 S street northwest, this city; occupation, private secretary to the Public Printer. Are you acquainted with William F. Mahoney, one of the parties to this interference? I am, how long have you known him? I am, about nine years. Have you any knowledge of an eye shade alleged to have been invented by Mr. Mahoney? If so, state briefly what you know about it? My knowledge of the shade which Mr. Mahoney claims to have invented comes from my acquaintance with him. I know of an exhibition of the shades in question to me. The one I noticed particularly was in my office sometime in the early spring of 1898. I can only recall distinctly the one which Mr. Mahoney left on my desk. Examine the eye shade now handed to you, and state how it compares in construction and mode of operation with the shade which Mr. Mahoney showed to you in the early spring of 1898. This looks to me like the same shade with the exception that there was a strap in the center of the strap. The material and construction other than this seems to be the same. Where was Mr. Mahoney employed in the early spring of 1898? He was employed in the paper warehouse of the Government Printing Office. Now are you able to fix the date, namely, "the early spring of 1898?" From the fact that that spring Mr. Mahoney was taken down with a spell of sickness, and also, it was before my wife was taken ill with typhoid fever, which occurred in the 1898. Examine the article now handed to you and state what it represents. I should say that it represented the strap similar to that which was attached to the shade which I received from Mr. Mahoney in 1898. This strap is just identical by the witness is here introduced in evidence and marked Mahoney, Exhibit No. 5. When did you transfer Mr. Mahoney from the Main building to the Branch building, or office of the Superintendent of Documents? August 25, 1898.

Cross-examination by Mr. Lester: What did you do with the eye shade which you received from Mr. Mahoney? To the best of my recollection, I sent it to my brother at St. Paul, Minn. How long was it after you received it? I do not remember exactly. Did Mr. Sir, only to try it on. Do you think it had eyelets used in its construction? The strap was in two pieces, and there was one eyelet to connect them in the center. Have you any doubts about the manner in which the strap was attached at each end to the horns of the shade? I have not. Well, how were they attached? With McGill fasteners. Were these shades in general use in the Government Printing Office at that period? Not to my knowledge. What kind of shades were they using? I do not know of Mahoney making or exhibiting shades of a different construction from the

one about which you have testified? I do not. Do you know whether a laborer named Lazelle sold shades to the employees in the Government Printing Office at or before the time to which you have testified? At or about the time that I received the shade about which I have referred in my testimony, Mr. Mahoney stated to me that he would like to have Mr. Lazelle given a permit or the privilege of going into the office where the night forces were at work in order that he might dispose of some of these shades to the workmen employed at night. Mr. Mahoney was told that so long as Mr. Lazelle does not interfere with the employees in their work, there would be no objection. Whether he disposed of any in this way I do not know. I hand you an eye shade marked "Mahoney, Exhibit No. 3." Do you know whether such an eye shade as that was in use in the Government Printing Office in June, 1898? I do not know. Where was Mahoney employed during the spring of 1899? In the office of the Superintendent of Documents, in the Union Building. Was he ever sick at any other time than during the spring and summer of 1898, and remained prostrated in the workroom? Mr. Mahoney was absent during the summer of 1899, but whether it was beyond the limit of his regular leave of absence I cannot state, without consulting the records. You state here that you fix this time on account of the sickness of your wife in June, 1898? I do not know. You have confessed the sickness of your wife and the absence of Mahoney as you state in 1899. One afternoon there came to me word that an employee of the paper warehouse was very ill and prostrated in the workroom. I put on my hat and went down stairs from my office and found Mr. Mahoney very sick, and apparently unconscious. I directed one of the employees to run for a doctor, which he did, and in the meantime telephoned to Mr. Felix Mahoney that his brother was very ill at the office. This, of course was in the spring of 1898, sometime prior to Mr. Mahoney's transfer to the Union Building, which was in August, 1898, the 25th of August. Can you fix the date, the month, in which Mahoney was taken sick? I remember it was a short time after my wife was taken ill with typhoid fever. She had given up and gone to her bed on the 15th day of June, 1898. Mr. Mahoney's illness was within a week from that time.

Is it a part of your duty as private secretary to the Public Printer to go through the Government Printing Office whereby you would have an opportunity to observe whether the printers therein were wearing eye shades similar to those made by Mr. Mahoney? It is not.

OSCAR RICKETTS.  
It will be observed that Mr. Ricketts took advantage of the attorney's ignorance of his relationship to Mr. Mahoney and omitted to state that he was anything but an acquaintance of Mr. Mahoney. Mr. Lester has a son in St. Paul, and he instructed the youth to interview Mr. Ricketts' brother about the eye shade sent him, but the telegram was too quick for the mails and Mr. Ricketts' brother had been forewarned and shut up like a clam.

The Globe rests its case against the Government Printing Office for the present and submits the mass of facts it has published to the public in general and Mr. Palmer in particular. That the Government Printing Office not only needs a new head, but tail and body, there can be but one conclusion. It is Mr. McKinley's move!

### OFF FOR JAPAN.

Hydrographer Ourlan and a Lady Assistant.

Mr. Vincent L. Ourlan, mentioned in connection with an item in last Sunday's Globe, touching the Hydrographer's Office of the Navy Department, is to sail for Japan to complete a contract with the Japanese government for the introduction into that kingdom of his system of chart engraving.

By one of those ever recurring coincidences, Mr. Ourlan discovered that only one lady in the world could read his charts or help him in his work, and she must accompany him or his mission would be a failure. It is needless to state that this lady is not Mr. Ourlan's wife; that is to say, it is needless to state to the employees of the Hydrographer's Office or to Mrs. Hancock and her boarders, at No. 1702 F street N.W.

The lady recently discharged from the Hydrographer's Office, mention of whom was made in last Sunday's Globe, has wonderfully excited the sympathies of Mr. Ourlan, and quite naturally they have been acquainted a long period of time, and have worked in the same office. If Mr. Ourlan should prefer this lady as an assistant in his scientific work for the Japs it is because she is the only woman in the world who can entirely come up to the qualifications he deems necessary to a helpmate. He will be alone in a foreign country for a long period, and it will be home-like and pleasant to have for an assistant a countrywoman with whom he can confide in. Why, then, should not the chief clerk of the superintendent of the Indian Affairs, hence his full name, be in the office of the Indian Affairs, and be especially down on old soldiers in the Dead Letter Office and uses his every effort to crowd extra work on them, to exhaust the poor devils. But he has taken particular care of his daughter and now she is chief clerk of the superintendent of the free delivery at a salary of \$1,500. This is done by Machen, the steel book man, to make himself solid with the subs of this administration.

Machen is a "reformed" Democrat on the pay that is in it, and this girl starting from a clerk at \$1,500 for eight years now gets \$1,800, or probably \$2,000, the pay roll will show, as chief clerk of free delivery.

W. H.

Washington, May 28.

Editor GLOBE: What you are writing up epitomizes why not say something about the superintendent of the Dead Letter Office. One Liebhart holds that position at a large salary. He was appointed under the administration of Harrison. He claims to be a soldier in an Indian Regiment, hence his full name. He at once had his daughter installed in the office of the Superintendent of the Free Delivery system. He was turned out under Cleveland and reinstalled under McKinley, and still holds the place. He is especially down on old soldiers in the Dead Letter Office and uses his every effort to crowd extra work on them, to exhaust the poor devils. But he has taken particular care of his daughter and now she is chief clerk of the superintendent of the free delivery at a salary of \$1,500. This is done by Machen, the steel book man, to make himself solid with the subs of this administration.

Machen is a "reformed" Democrat on the pay that is in it, and this girl starting from a clerk at \$1,500 for eight years now gets \$1,800, or probably \$2,000, the pay roll will show, as chief clerk of free delivery.

W. H.

Washington, May 28.

Editor GLOBE: What you are writing up epitomizes why not say something about the superintendent of the Dead Letter Office. One Liebhart holds that position at a large salary. He was appointed under the administration of Harrison. He claims to be a soldier in an Indian Regiment, hence his full name. He at once had his daughter installed in the office of the Superintendent of the Free Delivery system. He was turned out under Cleveland and reinstalled under McKinley, and still holds the place. He is especially down on old soldiers in the Dead Letter Office and uses his every effort to crowd extra work on them, to exhaust the poor devils. But he has taken particular care of his daughter and now she is chief clerk of the superintendent of the free delivery at a salary of \$1,500. This is done by Machen, the steel book man, to make himself solid with the subs of this administration.

Machen is a "reformed" Democrat on the pay that is in it, and this girl starting from a clerk at \$1,500 for eight years now gets \$1,800, or probably \$2,000, the pay roll will show, as chief clerk of free delivery.

W. H.

Washington, May 28.

Editor GLOBE: What you are writing up epitomizes why not say something about the superintendent of the Dead Letter Office. One Liebhart holds that position at a large salary. He was appointed under the administration of Harrison. He claims to be a soldier in an Indian Regiment, hence his full name. He at once had his daughter installed in the office of the Superintendent of the Free Delivery system. He was turned out under Cleveland and reinstalled under McKinley, and still holds the place. He is especially down on old soldiers in the Dead Letter Office and uses his every effort to crowd extra work on them, to exhaust the poor devils. But he has taken particular care of his daughter and now she is chief clerk of the superintendent of the free delivery at a salary of \$1,500. This is done by Machen, the steel book man, to make himself solid with the subs of this administration.

Machen is a "reformed" Democrat on the pay that is in it, and this girl starting from a clerk at \$1,500 for eight years now gets \$1,800, or probably \$2,000, the pay roll will show, as chief clerk of free delivery.

W. H.

Washington, May 28.

Editor GLOBE: What you are writing up epitomizes why not say something about the superintendent of the Dead Letter Office. One Liebhart holds that position at a large salary. He was appointed under the administration of Harrison. He claims to be a soldier in an Indian Regiment, hence his full name. He at once had his daughter installed in the office of the Superintendent of the Free Delivery system. He was turned out under Cleveland and reinstalled under McKinley, and still holds the place. He is especially down on old soldiers in the Dead Letter Office and uses his every effort to crowd extra work on them, to exhaust the poor devils. But he has taken particular care of his daughter and now she is chief clerk of the superintendent of the free delivery at a salary of \$1,500. This is done by Machen, the steel book man, to make himself solid with the subs of this administration.

Machen is a "reformed" Democrat on the pay that is in it, and this girl starting from a clerk at \$1,500 for eight years now gets \$1,800, or probably \$2,000, the pay roll will show, as chief clerk of free delivery.

## IS HE IMMUNE?

The Evil Resultant From Life  
Tenure on the Bench.

### JUSTICE BRADLEY AND THE LAW

A Sample Case Demonstrating His Autocratic Powers and the Singular Fact That He Is Above the Law Like a King and Kaiser—His Own Sweet Will Superior to Acts of Congress—Not Amenable to Public Opinion.

The judges of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia are appointed by the President of the United States and they hold their office for life, practically. Their salaries are ample and paid by the Government, no matter whether they work or play. They may go away on a trip at any time and be absent a month. This makes no difference with the salary. They may come upon the bench at any time of the day, and may leave at any time. They often come on at 10 a. m., and leave at 12 m. or 1 p. m. They suit themselves; the salary is never docked.

As to their rulings and decisions, they are as absolute as the Sultan of Turkey or the Shah of Persia, except in the cases of wealthy suitors, who are able to take an appeal to a higher tribunal. In the case of poor suitors their decisions are final, for it costs from one to two hundred dollars to get up into the Court of Appeals.

On the 31st of January, 1901, a wife filed a bill for divorce on the charge of cruelty—No. 22,092. Equity was taken. The papers now on file show that she was permitted, on account of her poverty, to file this bill and carry on her suit without the payment of costs, the permission having been granted by the kindness of Judge Stoughton, after a careful examination of the merits of the case, as far as they appeared on the face of the bill. Such a permit is a humane provision of the courts, in as the rich may be protected against order that the deserving poor as well oppressed.

The bill shows that there are four children in the family of the parties to the suit—one girl of seven years and three boys, the oldest being about 14. There is filed with the bill a contract or "memorandum of agreement," dated November 13, 1899, signed by both parties, by the terms of which they were to live separate, the wife taking with her a share of the household goods and the four children; the husband to pay \$5 a week for their maintenance. The bill filed shows that he made the payments as agreed down to July, 1900, when he refused to pay more than \$2 a week, and that in the following September he ceased to pay at all.

An answer to this bill is filed and is signed by the defendant, Judge A. C. Bradley, appointed an examiner to take the testimony in the case, as is usual. The defendant insisted on having the testimony taken in shorthand, and six witnesses were examined on behalf of complainant. That the bill was \$52.50, the court allowing 25 cents a 100 words.

According to all precedent, the court orders the defendant to pay for the testimony, whereas the defendant is the man, on the ground that he is the one who has in his hands the management of the family affairs, and controls the income. In this case, it was shown in evidence that the husband was caring for one of the children, which he had refused to contribute further to the support of the mother, with other children. The mother, with other children, had obtained a place to work, which paid her \$20 a month, but she was obliged then to keep a servant, so that she did not get ahead much by this tack. The husband was shown to be in receipt of about \$40 a month; yet the judge "denied" a motion for an order on the defendant to compel him to contribute something to assist the wife in maintaining the three children, or to pay for her testimony.

Next the defendant came into court, by his attorney, and moved his testimony might be taken in open court, which was granted. This enabled him to put in his testimony without expense, to which the complainant made no objection, supposing that her testimony might be taken in the same way. In this, however, she was mistaken. The judge, having before him the affidavit of the complainant's attorney, who brought her case into court in the first place, insists now that she shall pay \$52.50 for the testimony taken in her behalf, showing the cruelty charged by the bill, or to trial without any testimony in her behalf, except such as is strictly necessary to the effect of the complainant's testimony. As no divorce can be allowed without proof, the judge's rulings are equivalent to a denial of justice.

Judge Bradley is one of Cleveland's appointees—a President, appointed. It was currently reported at the time through the influence of Dr. Bartlett, pastor of the Presbyterian church, where Cleveland was supposed to attend. If the complainant in this case is getting Presbyterian justice, may the gods deliver us from any more of it. And yet there is not a newspaper in the District of Columbia outside of The Sunday Globe that could be induced to publish a line of any injustice committed by any judge of the Supreme Court here.

Judge Bradley is an autocrat—a little god—and holds his place for life, and owes no thanks therefore to the people of the District, whose lives and fortunes are in his hands; and it is not likely that public opinion will be able to penetrate his tough hide, or change his natural disposition to play the despot.

Judge Bradley is not only despotic, but impotent. A man who says "the law is on my side" should be yet in the seventh grade of the public schools.

Might not these judges be more courteous to those over whom they preside—not for life, but for a short term? We are informed, however, that there is at present hardly more than one Judge Bradley at present on the bench—that most of them are gentlemen of ability and refinement. We might mention Chief Justice Bingham, for one, and Associate Justice Barnard, one of McKinley's appointees, for another, who have scarcely an enemy among those who practice in this court.

Not wishing to scandalize the per-

ties to the suit above referred to, we omit the names, but hundreds of our readers will recognize them by this article.

As to the propriety of granting divorces, we say little at this time. On this question opinions vary about as much as on the question of religion. If Judge Bradley is decidedly opposed to granting divorces, as is reported, we submit that he has no right to substitute his individual opinion for statutory law, or for common law; for if he does, how shall any lawyer know how to advise his clients?

The statute, as it now stands, enacted by the Congress of the United States, allows divorce on the ground of "cruelty." Is it right for this judge to use his high office to prevent any divorce except for adultery, as the New Testament, divorces should be granted on no other ground. Shall his individual religious opinion be set up against the combined wisdom of Congress? He was appointed to enforce the laws, not his individual opinions.

THE DISTRICT DISGRACE.

Another Chapter on the Washington Asylum.

In order to give the public a further insight into the deplorable condition of affairs existing at the Washington Asylum, The Globe gives in this issue a few sample items which are vouched for by the best authority, and a perusal of which can but strike the reader with contempt for the officials who are responsible for the bad state of affairs.

W. H. Stoughton, not long ago put in charge of the workhouse an Englishman by the name of Thornton. Among other duties it was his business to keep a record of all prisoners coming and going; and also to keep accurate account of the clothing, bedding, etc., and receive all money and valuables belonging to the prisoners, and keep the same and return their property at the expiration of their sentences. Thornton seems to have made a business of keeping watches and other things from the poor unfortunates, and not only that, but he kept all the money he could get from the prisoners, sums ranging from 25 cents to \$25 and over. In addition to this he borrowed all the money from colored men who would lend to him. He was also in the habit of selling towels, soap, thread, sheeting, cotton, matches, etc., all belonging to the institution.

The supposition, by many people, was that Mr. Stoughton was paying back all this money out of his own pocket. Not so. The truth is that the money used in this business came out of the funds left in charge of the clerk of the Almshouse by inmates, or paupers, who have died possessed of small amounts of money ranging from \$2 upwards. During many years these amounts have accumulated to a large sum, and out of this fund Mr. Stoughton has been paying back these different amounts. Now, everybody knows that all the money that has been left by the inmates or paupers of the Almshouse belongs to the government and should be turned into the hands of the government. Mr. Stoughton has no more right to use such money than he has to put his hand in our pocket to get money for this purpose, but this is but another of his methods of running the establishment. When paying back these amounts he would caution the inmates not to say anything about the matter, well knowing that if the facts leaked out they would show up theintendent in a very bad light.

This man Thornton has left the Asylum and no one knows where he is, but the infamous conduct of Mr. Stoughton has not been exposed. Thornton has been in his power, stamps him as a man of the meanest and most contemptible stripe, and yet he is shielded in his conduct by Stoughton's bluff, and we might say, further, that Stoughton is shielded by Commissioner Ross.

As in the case of the public schools, Congress will be asked to legislate Stoughton out of office. Complaint against him has been made out of the workhouse, and a bill has been introduced in the House and called in the Senate. Investigations have been made, and the matter whitewashed, as usual, and the whole business fell through.

Mr. Ross has been told that the management of the Washington Asylum was foul to a disgraceful extent, but he has refused to take any steps to better its condition in any way.

The few facts contained in this excerpt are sufficient to cause the removal of W. H. Stoughton, if the District Commissioners cared anything for clean and efficient management of the institution. If not, let appearances nothing will be done about the matter until the attention of Congress is again called to the deplorable state of affairs. John W. Ross is primarily responsible for the conduct of the Washington Asylum, and it is a blot on the good name of the District, and if he has been unable to secure a right man for the place of Intendant, he ought not to allow the present incompetent official to hold on to the office, for in so doing he is a partner in his incompetency. If no improvement can be made, Mr. Ross ought to resign himself. He says he would resign before he would dismiss Stoughton.

We cannot think the President made a wise selection when he chose John W. Ross for Commissioner. Had Mr. McKinley known the state of affairs existing in the District he would not have appointed Mr. Ross to the Commission.

In the organization of the nineteenth Board of Commissioners, Mr. Ross, seeing the failure of his management of the School Board and the public school, turned them over to Mr. McFarland, and takes the police department, and keeps the Washington Asylum so as to cover up the rotten management of W. H. Stoughton. Congress was appealed to for relief, and the school board was reformed, but it was so late in the session that they could not act upon it. But Mr. P. J. Ovey, of the District Committee, had a bill favorably reported by the committee. Mr. Ovey also visited the Workhouse and found things rotten, just as had been repeatedly stated in the press and elsewhere, and we suppose he made a statement of facts to the Commissioners. After his examination of the conditions of the Workhouse, Mr. Ovey says he finds abundant ground for complaint, and still Mr. Ross de-lays appointing some one at the Asylum who has ability to conduct the place on business principles, and in a thoroughly clean manner.

## JUDGE T. J. MACKEY

His Address Torn Out of This Week's "News Letter."

### ROW IN MR. SABINE'S CHURCH

The Sunday Globe has an Unmutilated Copy Which Judge Mackey Can Have—The Address in Full—Revolution Among the Saints at 11th and E Streets—Mrs. Eddy Excommunicates the Whole Outfit.

Sunday last The Globe contained an article on Colonel Sabine and his opposition to the Christian Science Church, 11th and E streets. The details were given of trouble among the high priests of the faith.

It appears The Globe failed getting at the bottom of the agitation now going on among the leading saints in Sabine's Reform Christian Science Church. This week we have an astounding revelation to make which will, no doubt, "bust" the church and send Sabine back to peddling lightning rods or accident insurance. The issue of the "Washington News Letter," the organ of the church, edited and published by Colonel Sabine at Anderson's on Tenth street, was issued Wednesday morning last, and before a copy was permitted to go out the head of the church, Colonel Sabine, was seen leaving his lair and sending off post-haste for half a dozen boys to tear a page out of the paper. This page is numbered 569-570, and it contains the subjoined address of Judge T. J. Mackey, well known for his litigation in the courts of a domestic and personal nature. The address was ruthlessly torn from the "News Letter" and the mutilated copy sent out to subscribers.

The Globe desires to inform Judge Mackey that we have an unmutilated copy of the "News Letter," which he can have by calling at our office. He may, for himself, that his address in full is in the same, while it is omitted or torn out bodily from the entire edition.

The why and wherefore of this action on the part of Col. Sabine The Globe, at present, is ignorant of, being a natural peace maker, we furnish Judge Mackey the information that he may take the necessary steps to vindicate himself and bring Colonel Sabine to account.

Here is Judge Mackey's address, heading and all, as it appears in the "News Letter," before Colonel Sabine ordered it torn out:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER.

"Reaping Where Thou Hast Not Sown"—False Preaching.

Remarks of Judge T. J. Mackey at the Meeting of the Reform Christian Science Church, March 29, 1901.

"It was announced at our last experience meeting, Wednesday, 13th inst., that the so-called church of Christ Scientist, had formulated and issued an edict under the instruction of the supreme head for the destruction of the Reform Christian Science Church."

"As a member of that organization, affected by anything that injures it organically, I deem it proper to notice the fact mentioned in that communication. In dealing with the head of that so-called church of Christ, I will eliminate from my consideration whatever touches her as a woman and deal with her only as a public teacher, as one professing to be the subject of divine revelation and to be commissioned as the inspired instructor of her fellow beings."

"Mrs. Eddy's personal record; that would indeed fatigue the indignation if I were to touch upon it."

"The tests of every system by which we are to ascertain the principles upon which it is based, and the extent of its influence, is to be tested by its results. It does not require a large acquaintance with philosophical or religious literature to test the Truth of that claim, as one who enters any great public library of this country and stretches out his hand and takes down the works of Berkeley, Bishop of Clonfert, Ireland, can find that this alleged 'revelation' to the head of the so-called Church of Christ Scientist was declared to the world by Berkeley in the year of 1710. Berkeley was a man as illustrious for his achievements in the realm of self as he was in the realm of religion. He was worthy of veneration for his personal character. He states distinctly that there is no life, intelligence, or sensation in matter; that Mind is All in All, and not only has Mrs. Eddy appropriated his idea, but she has appropriated it most ungratefully, appropriating in great part the very words of Berkeley, and yet he is unnamed in the volume upon which the fame of Mrs. Eddy is founded as a public teacher."

"Though a lecture was delivered by Colonel Sabine in Massachusetts over a year ago in which the statement of the Science of Being was properly accredited to Berkeley by him, Mrs. Eddy remained silent until thirty days ago, when in the columns of the New York Journal she admitted that she had read the works of Berkeley and agreed with him, as puerile an admission as if one claimed to have recently discovered the law of Attraction and Gravitation, which holds the earth and her sister planets in their orbits, that when the discovery was attributed to Sir Isaac Newton, and the fraudulent claim exposed, should come out and declare 'I agree with Sir Isaac Newton.'"

"Now, it is not a revelation by his- torical tests, because previously published, that a revelation when tested by the Bible, Mrs. Eddy in her work distinctly charges upon Christ a consummate fraud. Fourteen times did He announce to His disciples before His crucifixion that He would be killed; that he would be put to death, and that He would rise again the third day, but this book specifically denies that Jesus died upon the cross. She declares that not His dead body, but His living body was entombed, and that in the darkness of the sepulchre He treated Himself, and walked forth from its gloom. That is her specific denial, and it is not a revelation, for it directly contradicts the Bible Truth. She distinctly denies prayer and de-

clares that the Christian Scientist has but little use for prayer. The first appeal made to the apostles of Jesus to their divine Master was 'Lord, teach us how to pray.' Prayer and Love form the everlasting rock of the Christian system, which Christian Science, wherever it is taught, recognizes and enforces. Prayer is the executive power of Love, and transmits it as the most potent and effective spiritual force. Prayer is the Christian's vital breath, the Christian's watchword at the gates of death; he enters Heaven with prayer. That is declared in this work entitled 'Science and Health.' The author of it is this alleged High Priestess of Christianity. This book declares marriage, which is the foundation of the home, which received the sanction of Christ by His performing a marriage feast; His first miracle. It declares that the world will be peopled in future ages by spiritual unions alone—that is to say, the fatherhood and motherhood will depart from the home, that humanity upon the earth will thus be homeless. That proposition is free love, pure and simple. It is not taught by the Christian Church, but may be learned in the divorce courts of this country."

"Now, this so-called Church of Christ has uttered a bold unmitigated blasphemy in terming Christ a Scientist. A Scientist is one who is searching after the Truth, and Jesus Christ is Himself the Way, the Truth, and the Life; but they have launched their bolt, and for whose breast is it intended? It is intended for this Reform Christian Science Church by destroying its leader, Oliver C. Sabine; but thank God, he reads closely in the footsteps of the Healer of the Nations, and his name is a benediction in thousands of homes, in far off lands, and in the islands of the sea, clothed as he is in the armor of righteousness, the shafts of envy, hatred, and malice, will be shattered upon his breast plate and fall harmless at his feet. I believe, so far as this church is concerned, we shall move on in our benign work, following in the steps of Jesus, and I am satisfied that this edict of excommunication issued by the sham high priestess of the so-called Church of Christ Scientist, will be ineffective to disturb our triumphal march through the world as was the bold edict of Alexander VI. in the sixteenth century, when a comet was flaming through the skies of Italy, putting her people in great terror, he issued a papal bull to stop its march through the heavens, but it was issued in vain."

A SLIGHT ADMONITION.

To the Captain of the Watch in the Interior Department.

Captain Halleck, an ex-army officer himself, and in the receipt of practically two salaries from the Government, is rather arbitrary and oppressive toward the employees under him in the Interior Department.

As captain of the watch he ought to remember that the clock he holds is not of such superlative importance, but that this great and mighty country could get along even if the office and the man were wiped off the face of the earth. The old soldiers are loud in their complaints of the captain and he has even been reported to certain Senators by a committee from the Department. Where there is so much smoke there must be considerable fire and this The Globe, at present, refrains from fanning into a blaze, in the hope that enough has been said, in this item, to remind the captain that ex-private soldiers of the civil war put their share in saving the Government, even though they carried muskets and six rounds, instead of well stuffed haversacks and canteens of commissary whiskey. A retired army officer has no more reason to exhibit his title brief authority, in an oppressive manner, over old soldiers than a Polish Jew or a naturalized Gentile.

The captain's retired pay and his salary as captain of the watch fixes him comfortably and he ought to sympathize with rather than oppress his humbler comrades who have borne the heat, the burden, and the real dangers of the march, the line of battle and the fighting.

"There are Others."

Washington, D. C., May 3, 1901.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLOBE:

DEAR SIR: Your fearless and hard-hitting journalism has been what has been needed for a long time, and I sincerely trust that the thinking public at large will wisely inform themselves through its columns. Rascality of all kinds is largely cloaked and fostered in the Departments. Money can be borrowed by passing drawing government salaries and not even interest can be swindled, even though they obtain judgment by Department employees. A Department employee, drawing a salary ranging from seven hundred and upward, can make a practice of borrowing and using other people's substance, and yet plead inability to pay, and can hold his position indefinitely, providing he has the right pull (influence).

Again, the civil service is largely ignored and ignored for the special benefit of a certain paper-collared clique who have never risked life or limb for